

DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 134 881

CG 011 056

AUTHOR Peirog, John J.; Lee, Glenda
TITLE The Effects of the Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act of 1974 Upon Employers' Perceived Value of Student Credentials. Educational Policy Systems.
PUB DATE 13 May 76
NOTE 36p.; Ed.D. Practicum, Nova University; Best copy available
EDRS PRICE MF-\$0.83 HC-\$2.06 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Academic Records; Confidential Records; Credibility; *Educational Legislation; Educational Research; *Employer Attitudes; *Employment Practices; Organization Size (Groups); *Student Records; Surveys
IDENTIFIERS *Buckley Amendment

ABSTRACT

The nature of the problem investigated deals with the perceived value of student credentials by organizations since the enactment of the Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act. The study investigates correlation between organizational size and perceived value, as well as determination of significant difference between social and industrial organizations and those who hire predominately degree recipients and those who do not with respect to this legislation. A survey questionnaire was developed and mailed to 125 randomly selected industrial and social organizations. The responses were analyzed according to the aforementioned areas. Sixteen percent of the surveys received indicated a decrease in perceived value. There was no correlation between organizational size and mean value of credentials, and no significant difference in perceived value of credentials between organizations who hire predominately degree recipients and those who do not. The results did indicate that industrial organizations place less value on student credentials than social organizations. It was recommended that the student credential forms be modified in order to allow students to waive their right to view these credentials. It is recommended that studies be carried out in this area to determine what areas of concern organizations have with respect to student credentials. The results shall further be utilized with respect to job placement counseling. (Author)

* Documents acquired by ERIC include many informal unpublished *
* materials not available from other sources. ERIC makes every effort *
* to obtain the best copy available. Nevertheless, items of marginal *
* reproducibility are often encountered and this affects the quality *
* of the microfiche and hardcopy reproductions ERIC makes available *
* via the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). EDRS is not *
* responsible for the quality of the original document. Reproductions *
* supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made from the original. *

ED134881

CG

The Effects Of The Family Educational Rights And Privacy Act
Of 1974 Upon Employers' Perceived Value
Of Student Credentials

Educational Policy Systems

by

John J. Pierog, M.Ed.

York College of Pennsylvania

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRO-
DUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM
THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGIN-
ATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS
STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT
OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

Dr. Glenda Lee

Bedford

A PRACTICUM PRESENTED TO NOVA UNIVERSITY
IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE
DEGREE OF DOCTOR OF EDUCATION

NOVA UNIVERSITY

May 13, 1976

CG 011056

Writer's Name John J. Pierog

Cluster Bedford

I certify that I have read this practicum report and have discussed its contents with the writer.

May 22, 1976
(date)

Sharon B. Brown
(signature of peer reader)

I certify that I have read this practicum report and have discussed its contents with the writer.

May 22, 1976
(date)

Sharon B. Brown
(signature of peer reader)

I certify that I have read this practicum report and have discussed its contents with the writer.

May 22, 1976
(date)

Sharon B. Brown
(signature of peer reader)

.....
I certify that I have read this practicum report and that in my opinion it conforms to acceptable standards for practicums in the Doctor of Education Program.

(date)

(signature of Practicum Director)

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
Research Abstract.....	i
Peer Signature Sheet.....	iii
Title.....	1
Statement of the Problem.....	1
Hypothesis.....	1
Background and Significance.....	2
Definition of Terms.....	15
Limitations of the Study.....	16
Basic Assumptions.....	16
Procedure for Collecting the Data.....	18
Treatment of the Data.....	20
Results of the Study.....	21
Discussion, Implications and Recommendations.....	23
Bibliography.....	27
Appendixes	
A. Survey Letter.....	28
B. Survey Instrument.....	29
C. Follow-up Survey Letter.....	30

Research Abstract

Pierog, John J. - "The Effects Of The Family Educational Rights And Privacy Act Of 1974 Upon Employers' Perceived Value Of Student Credentials." A Research Practicum presented to Nova University in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the Degree of Doctor of Education. May 13, 1976.

The nature of the problem investigated deals with the perceived value of student credentials by organizations since the enactment of the Family Educational Rights And Privacy Act. The study investigates correlation between organizational size and perceived value, as well as determination of significant difference between social and industrial organizations and those who hire predominately degree recipients and those who do not with respect to this legislation.

A survey questionnaire was developed and mailed to 125 randomly selected industrial and social organizations. The responses were analyzed according to the aforementioned areas.

Sixteen percent of the surveys received indicated a decrease in perceived value. There was no correlation between organizational size and mean value of credentials, and no significant difference in perceived value of credentials between organizations who hire predominately degree recipients and those who do not. The results did indicate that industrial organizations place less value on student credentials than social organizations.

It was recommended that the student credential forms be modified in order to allow students to waive their right to view these credentials. It is recommended that other studies be carried out in this area to

determine what areas of concern organizations have with respect to student credentials. The results shall further be utilized with respect to job placement counseling.

1. Title

This practicum is entitled "The Effects Of The Family Educational Rights And Privacy Act Of 1974 Upon Employers' Perceived Value Of Student Credentials."

2. Statement of the Problem

The problem to which this study addressed itself focused around the effects which the enactment of the Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act of 1974 has had on the value organizations placed on student credentials. Specifically, the study answers the following questions:

- a) Since the enactment of the Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act of 1974, what percentage of organizations placed less value upon student credentials?
- b) Did the size of the organizations significantly correlate with the value placed on student credentials?
- c) Is there a significant difference between those organizations who hire predominantly degree recipients, and those organizations who do not, relative to their value placed on student credentials?
- d) Is there a significant difference between social organizations and industrial organizations relative to their value placed on student credentials?

3. Hypothesis

This study presents and postulates the following:

- a) Presentation of the percentage of organizations which place a lesser value on student credentials.

- b) There is no correlation between the perceived degree of value placed on student credentials and organizational size.
- c) There is no significant difference between organizations who hire predominately degree recipients and those who do not relative to their perceived value of student credentials.
- d) There is no significant difference between social organizations and industrial organizations relative to their perceived value of student credentials.

4. Background and Significance

The Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act (P.O. 93-380) better known as the "Buckley Amendment" is one of the most recent acts of government executed with the intent to alter or modify educational policy. The aforementioned legislation will be the focal point of discussion for this research study. It would, however, seem noteworthy and beneficial to mention, from a historical point of reference, those most significant occurrences which have acted as a catalyst in this seemingly ever increasing and constraining relationship between government and education. Because the Buckley Amendment is a very recent development in education there is virtually no available research relative to its effects on the educational community. Because of this, much of this section will deal with the effects of government interference with educational policies. A perusal of the limited amount of available literature will, however, lend support to the statement that there is certainly no lack of available opinions in this area. It

should further be noted that it is not the intent of this author to manifest any personal value judgment as to the effects--positive or negative--of this government-education relationship. It does, however, seem reasonable to accept the premise that acts of government have certainly had an effect on higher education in America today. Perhaps to begin from a historical prospective would further exemplify this point.

The conception of the relationship between government and education in America may be traced back many years. Your author would, however, begin by making note to the Morrill Act (1862) establishing the first land grant institutions.

Since that time there have been two other significant occurrences, both within the past three decades which have added substance to this relationship. The first of these occurrences was the enactment of the G.I. Bill and other student aid programs. The inception of these programs has brought billions of dollars to assist students in meeting their educational expenses. Billions of dollars which have, directly or indirectly, found their way into the doors of educational institutions. Notwithstanding, these funds have been paid to students; educational institutions have, in fact, become somewhat dependent on their continued existence. Again, to a not so limited degree, these programs allow government the flexibility to apply pressure to that lever of fiscal support at anytime in order to coerce, if necessary, educational institutions to adhere to governmental policy which may, in fact, alter or modify institutional policy.

In the more recent past, episodes of the late 1960's, the general challenge of higher education afforded government yet more reasons to strengthen that government-education relationship. Consider these occurrences. The credibility gap which existed because the "magical experience" higher education was said to provide for individuals was found not to exist. This credibility gap was further deepened by student unrest across the nation and a tremendously declining job market for college graduates. State legislators, charged with the responsibility of social welfare could no longer provide the increasingly needed public funds to assist an institution in which society itself had questionable worth. As a result it is found that lawmakers, previously concerned only with enrollment figures, are now involved in institutional policy-making. The policies they deal with may, in fact, emanate changes in course, program content, academic standards, and many other areas of educational policy in which they have absolutely no expertise. There is a great deal of controversy as to the right or responsibility of legislators to become involved in such areas. An article entitled, "Legislative Probe in Wisconsin", (February 17, 1976), states that "...the University of Wisconsin regents have voted unanimously to forbid the institutions staff members to cooperate with a proposed legislative investigation of academic programs." The proposal to investigate academic programs was suggested by State Auditor R.R. Rungwood who, according to this article "...suggested auditing certain academic programs to determine how well they are meeting their goals." The response from the

Board of Regents stated that "...the University had been evaluated by accrediting agencies made up of educators."

Today, in the decade of the 1970's we view a tremendous augmentation of this relationship between government and education. Educators find governmental pressure exerted from all three levels of both the federal and state governments. Education must respond to questions, comments, and reports from congeries of boards, committees and agencies. The effects which these forces have had on higher education encompasses virtually every area of institutional policy from admissions and discipline to employment, wage and promotion practices.

Affirmative Action, Title IX and the Buckley Amendment are among the fore-runners of topics discussed among educators today. Institutions may soon be questioning the apparent worth of federal and state program dollars when analyzing the actual institutional cost relative to complying with governmental standards and policies. In an article by C.M. Fields entitled, "Analyzing Campus Costs of Federal Programs", (November 3, 1975), some interesting facts are outlined. The article states that "...some institutions of higher education are now spending between one and four percent of their operating budgets on federal programs such as social security, equal-employment opportunity, and occupational health and safety, according to a detailed financial study by the American Council on Education." The study further describes the various institutions' studies. The large state university with enrollment figures around 33,000 and a budget of \$213 million, spent \$1.3

million on such programs, not including Social Security taxes and "...sixty-five percent of the \$1.3 million was spent on various equal-employment opportunity programs." This study has been somewhat understated because it could not include the cost of items such as staff time spent in relation to its programs. The study did not include any aspects of state government programs or policies.

When considering further rules and regulations government imposes on education it is also noteworthy to consider the latest development with the Veterans Administration. C.M. Fields, in an article entitled "Veterans Administration Rules Irk Colleges", (December 15, 1975), deals with regulations the Veterans Administration were considering to curb over payment of benefits to veterans enrolled in post-secondary educational institutions. The article states that "...the institutions of higher education complain that the rules, designed to force a closer monitoring and prompt reporting of veterans' attendance and academic program, will force them to make substantial and sometimes costly reviews of their procedure including, perhaps, the daily calling of rolls." The article goes on to state that "...some also view the rules as another example of the federal government's trying to correct a problem by requiring burdensome administrative procedures. They point to affirmative action and guaranteed student-loan regulations requiring detailed student surveys as other recent examples."

P.W. Semas, author of "Is Uncle Sam Muscling In?", (December 15, 1975), states that "...some education officials fear that the federal

government is moving to regulate post-highschool education in the same way that it now regulates airlines, stockbrokers, radio and TV stations, and drug companies." The article further states that "...there is some pretty terrific bureaucratic empire-building going on, says Eric Wormald, Vice-president of the Association of American Colleges. Over a quite short period they've been constantly changing their regulations, always in the direction of tighter control."

As stated earlier, though there is much controversy over the government-education relationship relative to interpretation of the legislation and the intent, educators are not short of opinions as to the effects some of this legislation has had. M.G. Scully, in an article entitled "Affirmative Action Scored", (July 8, 1974), directs his comments toward a study sponsored by the Carnegie Commission on Higher Education authored by R.A. Lester. Scully states that this study reports "federal efforts to increase the number of women and blacks on university faculties threatens to undermine the quality and morale of those faculties..." He further paraphrases Lester by stating that "many federal officials responsible for enforcing anti-bias regulations do not seem to understand the procedures and standards used in faculty self-government."

A question which would warrant further consideration would ask, how far would government go in the internal policies of an institution. K. Winkler, in an article entitled "H E W moves to Cut Off Funds From Maryland Universities", (December 22, 1975), remarked that "the Department of Health, Education and Welfare last week charged the state of

Maryland with perpetuating a segregated system of higher education. The Department began formal proceeding to bar the state's thirty public colleges and universities from receiving federal funds. Winkler, in a latter article entitled "Court Tells H E W to Halt Action Against Maryland", (January 12, 1976), stated that Federal Judge Edward S. Northrop told H E W to "...stop its formal proceedings to cut off federal funds to Maryland's public colleges and universities." Winkler further quotes Northrop as having stated that the Department of Health, Education and Welfare "...seems to go wherever it wants and do whatever it wants to do." The article further stated that there was approximately \$30 million involved.

The enactment of Title IX of the Educational Amendments of 1972 has created many problems on college campuses throughout the nation. In an article entitled "What Title IX Means", (September 29, 1975), it is stated that there are two basic provisions under the Title IX act relating to equal opportunity to both sexes inasfaras participation in athletic programs:

Section 86.41 prohibits discrimination on the basis of sex in the operation of the interscholastic intercollegiate, club or intramural athletic programs offered by an educational institution. Section 86.37 sets forth requirements for insuring equal opportunity in the provision of athletic scholarships.

Title IX will be followed by Educational Institutions without regard to the institutional policy or belief, or they shall forfeit federal dollars.

K. Winkler in an article entitled "Brigham Young University Challenges Parts of Bias Law", (October 28, 1975), deals with the aforementioned institution refusing to follow Title IX guidelines. The article quotes

trustees as having said that they:

...voluntarily choose to follow many of the regulations because we believe them to embody policies which are fair and just...But where we believe the regulations are unconstitutional or illegal and where they prohibit or interfere with the teaching or practice of high moral principles, we will not follow them.

The trustees specifically repudiated six areas of the text. The article further states that "the University has traditionally refused most federal grants,...just so it could avoid government interference. But the government moves into the private sector anyway and tries to regulate everything." Should H E W decide to cut off funding, \$1.3 million in research grants would be lost and those students receiving government sponsored student aid would not be allowed to use it at that institution.

At this point in time the reader should have a somewhat general knowledge of the government-education relationship from a historical point of reference. It does seem that a strong case has been established which will support the opening premise that acts of government have certainly had an effect on higher education in America today.

In considering the topic of this study, it would seem that a fitting prelude to dealing with the Family Education Rights and Privacy Act would center around the occurrences leading up to this legislation.

A.B. Fitt, in an article entitled, "The Buckley Amendment: Understanding It, Living With It", (Summer, 1975), deals in part with the problems being addressed in this legislation. Fitt states that "...the public story of the Buckley Amendment began May 9, 1974, when the Senator (James L. Buckley, New York) announced his intention to add a rider to the pending bill which ultimately became the Educational

Amendment of 1974." The article further states:

...in his (Buckley) remarks that day he deplored what he characterized as the "systematic violation" of the right of privacy of millions of children in the schools across the nation whose school records are routinely made available to governmental and other busy-bodies, and the rights of their parents, who are too often denied access to such information.

An article entitled "Rights for Parents", (September 2, 1974), deals with some examples of what Senator Buckley termed the systematic violation of the rights of privacy. According to that article, a nine-year-old boy who once hugged a classmate had "homosexual tendencies" written into his permanent record. A highschool student who criticized his principal on a radio station had "radical tendencies" placed on his record. The article goes on to state that these permanent records are virtually "...made available to almost anyone besides parents who ask to see them."

As one must surely agree the intent behind this legislation was most honorable. It did begin so innocently. The original legislation was, however, according to Fitt, "The Buckley Amendment: Understanding It, Living With It", (Summer, 1975),

...a masterpiece of wretched draftsmanship. It literally forbade revealing to a secondary school student any personal information from his own file, for instance, a Scholastic Aptitude Test (SAT) score. At the college level, it forbade release of any information to parents, while giving the student access to any financial information furnished by his family. Such harmless practices as putting out freshmen directories with names, ages, birthplaces, and prior schools attended were banned unless the written consent of everyone listed was obtained.

The original draft of this legislation signed and executed into law by the President did create many problems besides the ones previously

mentioned for all of the educational community. This original legislation would have opened files to parents of all students under the age of eighteen years. Consider some of the possible ramifications of various counselor's notes placed in their files which may have dealt with home situations. An article entitled "Open Files", (December 2, 1974) deals with the issue. The article states "...in the files are comments students make to advisors, some of them quite sordid information about parental relationships and conditions at home, explains District Superintendent, Dr. Paul Treatman of New York City. If the parents get to see this, it might well exacerbate the child's situation at home. Some things belong in confidential files."

The Buckley Amendment was signed into law and took effect November 19, 1974. The legislation itself allowed an institution forty-five days to comply with a request to view a student's record. During this period of time the educational community was in an uproar. In the article entitled "Open Files", (December 2, 1974), it was further stated that "...for colleges, the primary concern was confidential recommendations. Many college officials hastily removed them from files students might see. School principals scrambled to get psychiatric and medical reports out of their records." The patience of those administrators who did nothing at all hoping that by January when student/parent requests would have to be honored, many of the problems would be worked out, was surely rewarded.

According to an article entitled "Congress Revises Buckley Amendment On School Records", (December 20, 1974), it was stated that revisions and clarifications to the Buckley Amendment were passed. The

article further states that "...the major revision defines more precisely what records are--and are not--required to be open to students' or parents' inspection."

In an effort not to become bogged down with legislative rhetoric as to what the "Buckley Amendment" is, or is not, merely consider the following "lay" guidelines as to what the Amendment does as it relates specifically to this study--Student Credentials. According to the National Association of Student Personnel Administrators Division of Professional Relations and Legislation report, (January, 1975), certain records are unavailable to students. Among these unavailable records are "...confidential recommendations concerning...applications for employment..."and these same recommendations written after January 1, 1975, "...if the student has signed a waiver of access." The legislation further provides for a hearing to challenge the information contained in the credentials. Failure to comply with the "Buckley Amendment" will provide grounds for loss of funding with regard to programs sponsored by the United States Office of Education (unlike Title IX which threatens the loss of all federal funds).

The enactment of this legislation has further effected the policies of post-secondary educational institutions. Student credentials, at an earlier time, could provide a candid evaluation of an individual character. The author of such an evaluation could realistically and honestly appraise a student's ability and caliber without concern over possible legal ramifications from a student viewing those candid comments made about him.

The primary question asked in this study is, "Since the enactment of the Buckley Amendment, do organizations plan less importance on student credentials?" A question which the reader may also wish to consider is, "How much were these evaluations worth before this legislation?" An article by Oestreich, Clements, and McGinnis entitled "Are Faculty References Still Worth The Effort", (Winter, 1975), states that:

...in the April-May, 1968, issue of the Journal of College Placement, Richard M. Edwards of the University of Arizona cast very serious doubts on the present system of furnishing faculty references. Dr. Edwards reported that at a Rocky Mountain College Placement Association Conference ninety percent of the companies attending indicated, by show of hand, that they did not give major consideration to faculty comments in their evaluation of students as prospective employees.

In another study reported in this article, on the author, Charles A. Harkness of the Northern Illinois University Placement Center surveyed "...about 200 employers on the importance of faculty evaluations in deciding whether to invite a student for a second interview." This study indicated that 21 percent surveyed stated that the evaluation was an important part of the decision, 52 percent were occasionally influenced, 25 percent were seldom influenced and 2 percent were never influenced.

In summation let us consider the following. There does appear to be a relationship between government and education. This relationship exists because of various legislation enacted which involve or effect education in general. Education has to a degree become dependent on

governmental program-funding--either direct or indirect funding--within public or private institutions. Educational institutions have for the most part found it necessary to modify, alter and/or change institutional policy to fall into line with legislation.

In focusing on the direct problem of this study--the effect of the Buckley Amendment we investigated the following questions as previously alluded to:

- a) What is the percentage of organizations studied which place a lesser value on student credentials?
- b) Since the enactment of the Buckley Amendment, what percentage of organizations place less value upon student credentials?
- c) Is there a significant difference between those organizations who hire predominately degree recipients and those organizations who do not, relative to their value placed on student credentials?
- d) Is there a significant difference between social organizations relative to their value placed on student credentials?

The study was of significance to York College of Pennsylvania for many reasons. Because of the present economic situation in America we, as every other educational institution across the land, are trying desperately to place all graduates in a somewhat declining job market. Any study which will allow us to further develop our talents in this area is of significance.

The placement office of this institution is also presently reconstructing the student credential forms. The results of this study

provided this office with justification for the alternatives which are presently being made.

The results of this study are to be presented to an all college committee which will review the findings. It is hoped the study will stimulate discussion relative to other pertinent areas of possible investigation. It was this committee which originally suggested that a study as this one be undertaken.

The study seemed further important from an institutional perspective because the results would certainly enable student affairs offices to be more knowledgeable with respect to counseling students in the area of job placement and credentials.

Because the basis of this study deals with the somewhat constraining relationship between education and government, which has developed in the past years, it seems appropriate for the Core Module Educational Policy Systems.

5. Definition of Terms

The following terms were defined for the purpose of this study:

- a) Industrial Organizations - Organizations listed in the Industrial Directory (June, 1974) prepared by the York County Chamber of Commerce, York, Pennsylvania.
- b) Social Organizations - Organizations listed in the Directory of Social Services in York County (Fall, 1974) prepared by the United Way of York County, York, Pennsylvania.

- c) Student Credentials - Placement papers, letters of recommendation, and all other materials kept on file at the institution to assist students in job placement.

6. Limitations of the Study

The following limitations placed some restrictions on the validity, reliability, and applicability of the study:

- a) The effectiveness of the survey form designed and utilized for the purpose of this study may have imposed some limitations.
- b) The sample size, totalling 125 industries or agencies, may have imposed certain limitations.
- c) The participants in the study were representatives of either social or industrial agencies or companies as defined for the purpose of this study and may not adequately have represented the views and opinions of other type agencies or companies such as the retail industry and others that are neither social or industrial.

7. Basic Assumptions

The following basic assumptions were proposed for this study:

- a) It was assumed that at least 75 percent of the sample would respond to the survey. Since the college is very well known in the community and has many contacts, or has worked with many of these organizations. This did not seem unrealistic to assume. Usable surveys were received from 73 percent of the sample.

- b) It was further assumed that the enlistment of assistance from the College Publications Office, in the area of news releases regarding the study to local newspapers, would further assist in the endeavor of soliciting responses.
- c) It was also assumed that those individuals who completed the survey form were fully knowledgeable of the opinion and views of their organization.
- d) It was further assumed that if the individuals who completed the survey instrument were not fully aware of what the Family Educational Rights And Privacy Act of 1974 is, that there was sufficient information in the letter mailed with the survey to assist them in their knowledge of this legislation.
- e) It was assumed that those organizations utilized in the sample would validly have been either industrially or socially oriented as was stated in the respective reference material, the Industrial Directory and the Directory of Social Services in York County.
- f) It was further assumed that if the results of the study indicate a lesser value is now placed on student credentials, that it was a result of the enactment of the Family Educational Rights And Privacy Act of 1974 and not for any other reason.
- g) It was also assumed that the recipients of the letter and survey form would consider it of significant importance to complete the survey and return it by the appropriate date.

- h) A further assumption was that the limitations as previously stated would not adversely effect the results of the study.
- i) The final assumption made was that the study was of significant importance to warrant the time and expenses in carrying it out.

8. Procedure for Collecting the Data

The following procedure followed for the collection of the data procedes:

- a) A random sample of 100 industrial and 25 social organizations were selected from the Industrial Directory (June, 1975) and the Directory of Social Services in York County (Fall, 1974).
- b) A letter explaining the study and survey instrument were mailed to the individual listed in the above reference literature as Director or President of the organization. The sample letter and survey instrument form are included in the appendix.
- c) Before mailing, the name of the organization was typed on the survey form. This assisted in the follow-up procedure for those surveys which were not returned to the Student Affairs Office, the following procedures were followed:
 - 1) All those organizations which answered that they place a lesser importance on student credentials since the enactment of the Family Educational Rights And Privacy Act of 1974 were separated from those who do

not. The computation for percentage was then performed.

- 2) Those survey forms returned were then divided by size of organization to allow the computation to determine if the size of the organization significantly correlated with the value placed on the credentials.
- 3) The returned survey forms were then divided into those which reflect the hiring of predominately degree recipients and those which did not. This allowed the computation to determine if a significant difference existed between these groups relative to their value placed on student credentials. Those survey forms indicating a response of a + b (none to 30%) were considered as not hiring predominately degree recipients. Those survey forms indicating response E (over 75%) were considered as hiring predominately degree recipients.
- 4) The returned survey forms were then divided into social organizations and industrial organizations which allowed the computation to determine if a significant difference existed between the two groups relative to their value placed on student credentials.

9. Treatment of the Data

- A. The data was treated in the following manner to obtain the percentage of organizations which place less value on student credentials since the enactment of the Buckley Amendment.

x = number of usable responses indicating that less value was placed on student credentials since the enactment of the Buckley Amendment.

y = number of usable responses.

$x \div y$ = percentage of organizations which place less value on student credentials since the enactment of the Buckley Amendment.

- B. The data was then calculated to determine if there existed a significant correlation between organizational size and value placed on student credentials. The null hypothesis was tested.

There is no correlation between organizational size and value placed on student credentials.

$$H_{01} : p = 0$$

two tailed test

$$\alpha = .05$$

$$\text{Critical } -r \text{ value} = \underline{+ .217}$$

$$df = \underline{87 - 2} = 85$$

- C. The data was then calculated to determine if the mean value rating placed on student credentials by organizations who hire predominately degree recipients was significantly different from the mean value rating placed on student credentials for those

organizations who do not hire predominately degree recipients.

The null hypothesis was tested.

There is no significant difference in the mean value rating placed on student credentials by organizations who hire predominately degree recipients and those who do not.

$$H_{02} : \bar{x}_1 = \bar{x}_2$$

two tailed test

$$\alpha = .05$$

$$\text{Critical -t- value} = \underline{+ 1.99}$$

$$df = \underline{87 - 2} = 85$$

- D. The data was then calculated to determine if the mean value rating placed on student credentials by social organizations was significantly different from the mean value rating placed on student credentials by industrial organizations. The null hypothesis was tested.

There is no significant difference between the mean value rating placed on student credentials by social organizations and the mean value rating placed on student credentials by industrial organizations.

$$H_{03} : \bar{x}_1 = \bar{x}_2$$

two tailed test

$$\alpha = .05$$

$$\text{Critical -t- value} = \underline{+ 1.99}$$

$$df = \underline{87 - 2} = 85$$

10. Results of the Study

The following data are the results of this study:

$$A.) \quad 14 \div 87 = .16 = 16\%$$

Sixteen percent of the organizations surveyed indicated that they place a lesser value on student credentials since the enactment of the Buckley Amendment.

$$\begin{aligned} B.) \quad \sum xy &= 716 \\ nx &= 87 \\ \sum x &= 250 \\ \sum x^2 &= 850 \\ ny &= 87 \\ \sum y &= 249 \\ \sum y^2 &= 757 \end{aligned}$$

two tailed test (.05 l.o.c.)
Critical -r- value = $\pm .217$
Calculated -r- value = $\pm .006$

There is no correlation between organizational size and the value placed on student credentials. The null hypothesis must be accepted.

$$H_{O_1} : p = 0$$

$$\begin{aligned} C.) \quad \sum xy &= 89 \\ nx &= 77 \\ \sum x &= 216 \\ \sum x^2 &= 644 \\ ny &= 10 \\ \sum y &= 32 \\ \sum y^2 &= 108 \end{aligned}$$

two tailed -t- test (.05 l.o.c.)
Critical -t- value = ± 1.99
Calculated -t- value = ± 1.63

There is no significant difference in the mean value placed on student credentials between those organizations who hire predominately degree recipients and those who do not. The null hypothesis must be accepted.

$$H_{O_2} : \bar{x}_1 = \bar{x}_2$$

$$\begin{aligned}
 D.) \quad \sum xy &= 123 \\
 nx &= .74 \\
 \sum x &= 205 \\
 \sum x^2 &= 605 \\
 ny &= 13 \\
 \sum y &= 43 \\
 \sum y^2 &= 147
 \end{aligned}$$

two tailed -t- test (.05 l.o.c.)

Critical -t- value = ± 1.99

Calculated -t- value = -2.546

There is a significant difference in the mean value placed on student credentials between social organizations and industrial organizations. The null hypothesis is rejected.

$$H_{03} : \bar{x}_1 \neq \bar{x}_2$$

11. Discussion, Implications and Recommendations

The results of this study have determined that 16 percent of the organizations surveyed place less value on student credentials since the enactment of the Buckley Amendment. This does not seem to be a tremendously large percent; however, it does seem of interest. This would tend to imply that the decrease in perceived value of student credentials has not been so significant as to warrant great concern. It was interesting to note the unsolicited comments which were written by some respondents. All of these responses indicated that for one reason or another they believe that individuals writing letters of recommendation have always "played it safe" to quote one of the respondents. Though many in the student affairs division have not considered 16 percent to be a terribly significant decrease, it would be your author's recommendation to modify the student credential forms to allow students to waive their right to

view the recommendations. Part of this recommendation is based on the residual findings which were incidental to the study. These residual findings indicated that 13 percent of those surveyed indicated that they would place more value on student credentials indicating that the student had waived his or her right to view them.

The results of this study also indicated that there was no correlation between the size of an organization and the value which the organization placed on student credentials. This fact would most certainly imply that each organization has its own philosophy on student credentials and that implications cannot be drawn which would indicate that an organization of one size or another is more or less likely to view the importance of such records in any one particular way. The results of this section of the study would serve as a further counseling tool.

Furthermore, the results indicated that there is no significant difference in the value placed on student credentials between those organizations who hire predominately degree recipients, and those who do not. This information will further serve as an additional counseling aid.

It was, however, indicated that there is a significant difference in the mean value placed on student credentials between social organizations and industrial organizations. The statistics indicate that the mean value rating placed on student credentials is significantly lower for industrial organizations when compared to the mean value rating placed on their credentials by social organizations. These results can also be of importance when counseling students with regard to job placement.

The implications are as previously stated. Because 16 percent of the organizations surveyed indicated that they place a lesser value on student credentials since the enactment of the Buckley Amendment, and 13 percent indicated that they would place more value on student credentials if the students waived their rights to view the files, it would seem to imply that some are concerned with the validity of these credentials. Though the numbers are not necessarily significantly large, it would certainly seem more beneficial to students involved to allow them the option of waiving their right to view their credentials. This would mean that the forms themselves would have to be modified, and that is a definite recommendation.

The results indicating that there was found to be no correlation between organizational size and value placed on credentials, and no significant difference between those organizations who hire predominately degree recipients and those who do not, are important factors to be considered when counseling students with regard to their credentials. It is recommended that further studies be carried out on a larger scale to determine other common concerns of organizations with regard to student credentials. Perhaps utilization of a questionnaire which is composed both of multiple choice and open-ended questions would allow for more input. In such a case, organizations could voice their concerns more adequately.

As mentioned earlier, the significant difference which was found to exist between social and industrial organizations, with respect to

their perceived value of student credentials, implied that industrial organizations place a lesser value on these credentials as compared to the more socially oriented organizations.

Finally, it is further recommended that the results of this study be made public to members of the college community. This will allow for more effective counseling with respect to job placement. If the results of this study indicate the importance of further studies being undertaken which will in turn also lead to improved counseling of our students, then it has been of sufficient value to warrant its undertaking.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

"Congress Revises Amendment On School Records," Higher Education and National Affairs, XXIII, December 20, 1974, p.5.

Directory of Social Services in York County, United Way of York County, York, Pennsylvania, 1974.

Fields, C.M., "Analyzing Campus Costs of Federal Programs," The Chronicle of Higher Education, November 3, 1975, p.12.

-----, "Veteran's Administration Rules Irk Colleges," The Chronicle of Higher Education, December 15, 1975, p.9.

Fitt, A.B., "The Buckley Amendment: Understanding It, Living With It," College Board Review, 96, Summer, 1975, pp.2-5.

Industrial Directory, York County Chamber of Commerce, York, Pennsylvania, 1974.

"Legislative Probe In Wisconsin," The Chronicle of Higher Education, February 17, 1976, p.2.

Oestreich, Clements, and McGinnis, "Are Faculty References Still Worth the Effort," Journal of College Placement, Winter, 1975, pp.2-4, 58-60.

"Open Files," Newsweek, December 2, 1974, p.67.

"Rights for Parents," Time, September 2, 1974, p.61.

Scully, M.G., "Affirmative Action Scored," The Chronicle of Higher Education, July 8, 1974, p.8.

Semas, P.W., "Is Uncle Sam Muscling In?" The Chronicle of Higher Education, December 15, 1975, p.1.

"Summary Report on Amendments to the Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act of 1974, Section 513 of the Education Amendments of 1974," NASPA Report from Division of Professional Relations and Legislation, January, 1975.

"What Title IX Means," The Chronicle of Higher Education, September 29, 1975, pp.8-9.

Winkler, K.J., "Brigham Young University Challenges Parts of Bias Law," The Chronicle of Higher Education, October 28, 1975, pp.1, 10.

-----"Court Tells H E W to Halt Action Against Maryland," January 12, 1976, p.8.

-----"H E W Moves to Cut Off Funds from Maryland Universities," The Chronicle of Higher Education, December 22, 1975, pp.1, 6.

Appendix A

YORK COLLEGE OF PENNSYLVANIA
York, Pennsylvania

April 20, 1976

Dear Employer:

As you are probably aware, recent changes in Federal Legislation (The Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act of 1974) now require educational institutions to allow students to view their credentials (records and recommendations) which are kept on file.

The Division of Student Affairs at York College of Pennsylvania is conducting an important study to determine how this law has affected the value which our local employers now place on these credentials. It is our hope that the results of this study will be beneficial to both our students and you as prospective employers.

It is essential to this study that the individuals delegated responsibility for hiring practices at your company or agency, complete the enclosed survey and mail it in the postage paid self-addressed envelope by Tuesday, May 4, 1976.

Your participation in this study would be most sincerely appreciated.

Cordially,

John J. Pierog
Placement Counselor

JJP:lms
Enclosures 2

Appendix B

YORK COLLEGE OF PENNSYLVANIA

Company or Agency

DIRECTIONS: Please circle the correct response to the questions below and mail before Tuesday, May 4, 1976. A postage paid self-addressed envelope has been enclosed for your convenience.

1. Number of employees in your company or agency:
 - a. less than 25
 - b. 26 - 100
 - c. 101 - 250
 - d. 251 - 500
 - e. over 500
2. Approximate percent of positions which require a degree:
 - a. none
 - b. 10% - 30%
 - c. 30% - 50%
 - d. 50% - 75%
 - e. over 75%
3. Approximate percent of employees hired last year who were college graduates:
 - a. none
 - b. 10% - 30%
 - c. 30% - 50%
 - d. 50% - 75%
 - e. over 75%
4. Has your company or agency ever received student credentials (placement papers, letters of recommendation, and the like) from prospective job candidates?
 - a. yes
 - b. no
5. The enactment of the Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act of 1974 now extends students the right to view their credentials (placement papers, letters of recommendation, and the like). Before this time these credentials were considered privileged and confidential. Has the enactment of this legislation resulted in your company or agency placing a lesser value on these credentials?
 - a. yes
 - b. no
6. The legislation previously mentioned also allows students to waive their right to view their credentials. If you answered yes to question #5, would you place more value on the credentials of a student who has waived his right to view them?
 - a. yes
 - b. no
7. What value does your company or agency place on student credentials?
 - a. no value
 - b. little value
 - c. moderate value
 - d. considerable value

Appendix C

YORK COLLEGE OF PENNSYLVANIA
York, Pennsylvania

May 4, 1976

Dear Employer:

On April 20, 1976, you were sent a survey form from the Student Affairs Division of York College of Pennsylvania. This form was to have been directed to the individual responsible for hiring practices at your company or agency. It was requested that this individual complete the survey form and mail it in the postage paid self-addressed envelope by May 4. To this date we have not received a form from your company or agency. We can certainly understand that this is indeed a very busy time of year for all of us. We would, however, hope that you would follow up on the survey for us. It will only take a few moments to complete, and these results can be extremely meaningful for both our students and for you as prospective employers.

For your convenience, you will find a copy of the original survey form. Please complete this form and return it with the self-addressed stamped envelope also enclosed.

Thank you for your further time in our endeavors.

Sincerely,

John J. Pierog
Placement Counselor

JJP:lms
Enclosures 2